

general or conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations." Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Moreover, the statute does not on its face require any review at all of issues that are not the subject of an objection. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); Camby, 718 F.2d at 200. Nonetheless, a district judge is responsible for the final determination and outcome of the case, the Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge's M&R and the record accordingly.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Neither party objects to the findings of fact as set forth in the M&R; this Court therefore adopts the facts as set forth in the M&R for purposes of resolving these motions.

III. DISCUSSION

The Magistrate Judge properly found that the defendant's two-sentence "motion," which was not accompanied by a supporting brief, failed to meet the requirements of Local Rule 7.1(C). No objections were filed, and the Court thus adopts the M&R and the defendant's motion to dismiss is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IV. CONCLUSION

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that:

1. The M&R (Doc. No. 20) is adopted.
2. Defendant Michael Lee Roberts's Motion to Dismiss Complaint (Doc. No. 19) is **DENIED** without prejudice.

Signed: September 21, 2011



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
Chief United States District Judge



